arXiv:1602.00304v2 [math.AP] 9 Apr 2016

An N-barrier maximum principle for autonomous systems of n species and its application to problems arising from population dynamics

Chiun-Chuan Chen, Li-Chang Hung* and Chen-Chih Lai

Department of Mathematics, National Taiwan University, Taiwan

L.-C. Hung dedicates this work to Mach Nguyet Minh

Abstract

We show that the N-barrier maximum principle (NBMP) remains true for n $(n > 2)$ species. In addition, a stronger lower bound in NBMP is given by employing an improved tangent line method. As an application of NBMP, we establish a nonexistence result for traveling wave solutions to the four species Lotka-Volterra system.

1 Introduction

The main purpose of the present paper is to establish the N-barrier maximum principle (NBMP) for $n(n > 2)$ species, the case $n = 2$ having been considered previously ([3],[8]). To be more specific, we study the autonomous system of n species

$$d_i (u_i)_{xx} + \theta (u_i)_x + u_i^{m_i} f_i(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad i = 1, 2, ..., n, \tag{1.1}$$

where $u_i = u_i(x)$, $d_i, m_i > 0$, and $f_i(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times ... \times \mathbb{R}^+)$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., n$; $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Throughout, we assume, unless otherwise stated, that the following hypothesis on $f_i(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n)$ is satisfied:

[**H**] For $i = 1, 2, ..., n$, there exist $\bar{u}_i > \underline{u}_i > 0$ such that

$$f_i(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) \geq 0 \quad \text{whenever } (u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) \in \underline{\mathcal{R}};$$

$$f_i(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) \leq 0 \quad \text{whenever } (u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) \in \bar{\mathcal{R}},$$

*Corresponding author's email address: lichang.hung@gmail.com

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35B50; Secondary 35C07, 35K57.

Key words and phrases. Maximum principles, traveling wave solutions, reaction-diffusion equations.

where

$$\underline{\mathcal{R}} = \Big\{(u_1,u_2,...,u_n)\ \Big|\ \sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{u_i}{\underline{u}_i}\le 1,\ u_1,u_2,...,u_n\ge 0\Big\};$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}} = \Big\{(u_1,u_2,...,u_n)\ \Big|\ \sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{u_i}{\bar{u}_i}\ge 1,\ u_1,u_2,...,u_n\ge 0\Big\}.$$

We couple (1.1) with the prescribed Dirichlet conditions at $x=\pm\infty$:

$$(u_1,u_2,...,u_n)(-\infty)=\mathbf{e}_-,\quad (u_1,u_2,...,u_n)(\infty)=\mathbf{e}_+, \tag{1.2}$$

where

$$\mathbf{e}_-,\mathbf{e}_+\in\Big\{(u_1,u_2,...,u_n)\ \Big|\ u_i^{m_i}\,f_i(u_1,u_2,...,u_n)=0\ (i=1,2,...,n),u_1,u_2,...,u_n\ge 0\Big\} \tag{1.3}$$

are the equilibria of (1.1) which connect the solution $(u_1,u_2,...,u_n)(x)$ at $x=-\infty$ and $x=\infty$. This leads to the boundary value problem of (1.1) and (1.2):

$$\textbf{(BVP)}\begin{cases} d_i\,(u_i)_{xx}+\theta\,(u_i)_x+u_i^{m_i}\,f_i(u_1,u_2,...,u_n)=0,\quad x\in\mathbb{R},\quad i=1,2,...,n,\\[2mm] (u_1,u_2,...,u_n)(-\infty)=\mathbf{e}_-,\quad (u_1,u_2,...,u_n)(\infty)=\mathbf{e}_+.\end{cases}$$

(BVP) arises from the study of traveling waves in the following reaction-diffusion system of n species ([16],[18]):

$$(\omega_i)_t=d_i\,(\omega_i)_{yy}+\omega_i^{m_i}\,f_i(\omega_1,\omega_2,...,\omega_n),\quad y\in\mathbb{R},\ t>0,\quad i=1,2,...,n, \tag{1.4}$$

where $\omega_i(y,t)$ $(i=1,2,...n)$ is the density of the i-th species and d_i $(i=1,2,...n)$ represents the diffusion rate of the i-th species. A special solution $(u_1(x),u_2(x),...,u_n(x))=(\omega_1(y,t),\omega_2(y,t),...,\omega_n(y,t))$, $x=y-\theta\,t$, where θ is the propagation speed of the traveling wave, is a traveling wave solution of (1.4). It is easy to see that the traveling wave solution of such form satisfies (1.1).

Our main result is that **(BVP)** enjoys the following N-barrier maximum principle.

Theorem 1.1 (**NBMP for** n **Species**). *Assume that* [**H**] *holds. Given any set of* $\alpha_i>0$ $(i=1,2,...,n)$, *suppose that* $(u_1(x),u_2(x),...,u_n(x))$ *is a nonnegative* C^2 *solution to* ***(BVP)***. *Then*

$$\underline{\lambda}\le\sum_{i=1}^{n}\alpha_i\,u_i(x)\le\bar{\lambda},\quad x\in\mathbb{R}, \tag{1.5}$$

where

$$\bar{\lambda} = \Big(\max_{i=1,2,...,n}\alpha_i\,\bar{u}_i\Big)\Big(\max_{i=1,2,...,n}d_i\Big)\Big(\min_{i=1,2,...,n}d_i\Big)^{-1}, \tag{1.6}$$

$$\underline{\lambda} = \Big(\min_{i=1,2,...,n}\alpha_i\,\underline{u}_i\Big)\Big(\min_{i=1,2,...,n}d_i\Big)\Big(\max_{i=1,2,...,n}d_i\Big)^{-1}\chi, \tag{1.7}$$

with χ *defined by*

$$\chi=\begin{cases}0, & \textit{if}\quad \mathbf{e}_+=(0,...,0)\quad \textit{or}\quad \mathbf{e}_-=(0,...,0),\\ 1, & \textit{otherwise.}\end{cases} \tag{1.8}$$

We note that both the lower bound $\underline{\lambda}$ and the upper bound $\bar{\lambda}$ in NBMP do not depend explicitly on the propagation speed θ. To illustrate Theorem 1.1, we present an example. For $n = 3$, suppose that $m_i = 1$ and $f_i(u_1, u_2, u_3) = u_i\,(\sigma_i - c_{i1}\,u_1 - c_{i2}\,u_2 - c_{i3}\,u_3)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then **(BVP)** becomes

$$\textbf{(LV3)}\quad \begin{cases} d_1\,(u_1)_{xx} + \theta\,(u_1)_x + u_1\,(\sigma_1 - c_{11}\,u_1 - c_{12}\,u_2 - c_{13}\,u_3) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ d_2\,(u_2)_{xx} + \theta\,(u_2)_x + u_2\,(\sigma_2 - c_{21}\,u_1 - c_{22}\,u_2 - c_{23}\,u_3) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ d_3\,(u_3)_{xx} + \theta\,(u_3)_x + u_3\,(\sigma_3 - c_{31}\,u_1 - c_{32}\,u_2 - c_{33}\,u_3) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ (u_1, u_2, u_3)(-\infty) = \mathbf{e}_-, \quad (u_1, u_2, u_3)(\infty) = \mathbf{e}_+, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\mathbf{e}_-, \mathbf{e}_+ \in \Big\{(u_1, u_2, u_3) \;\Big|\; u_i\,(\sigma_i - c_{i1}\,u_1 - c_{i2}\,u_2 - c_{i3}\,u_3) = 0\ (i = 1, 2, 3), u_1, u_2, u_3 \geq 0\Big\}. \tag{1.9}$$

The parameters d_i, σ_i, c_{ii} $(i = 1, 2, 3)$, and c_{ij} $(i, j = 1, 2, 3$ with $i \neq j)$, which are all positive constants, stand for the diffusion rates, intrinsic growth rates, intra-specific competition rates, and inter-specific competition rates, respectively. A solution $(u_1(x), u_2(x), u_3(x))$ to **(LV3)** is a traveling wave solution which solves the competitive Lotka-Volterra systems of three competing species:

$$(\omega_i)_t = d_i\,(\omega_i)_{yy} + \omega_i\,(\sigma_i - c_{i1}\,\omega_1 - c_{i2}\,\omega_2 - c_{i3}\,\omega_3), \quad y \in \mathbb{R},\ t > 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \tag{1.10}$$

where $(\omega_1(y, t), \omega_2(y, t), \omega_3(y, t)) = (u_1(x), u_2(x), u_3(x))$, $x = y - \theta\,t$. When the diffusion terms are absent, (1.10) is the celebrated May-Leonard model ([13]) under the assumption that $\sigma_i = c_{ii} = 1$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$, $c_{12} = c_{23} = c_{31} = \mu_1 > 0$ and $c_{13} = c_{21} = c_{32} = \mu_2 > 0$

$$\begin{cases} (\omega_1)_t = \omega_1\,(1 - \omega_1 - \mu_1\,\omega_2 - \mu_2\,\omega_3), \quad t > 0, \\ (\omega_2)_t = \omega_2\,(1 - \mu_2\,\omega_1 - \omega_2 - \mu_1\,\omega_3), \quad t > 0, \\ (\omega_3)_t = \omega_3\,(1 - \mu_1\,\omega_1 - \mu_2\,\omega_2 - \omega_3), \quad t > 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.11}$$

where $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3) = (\omega_1(t), \omega_2(t), \omega_3(t))$.

From the viewpoint of the study of *competitive exclusion* ([1], [6], [7], [10], [14], [17]) or *competitor-mediated coexistence* ([2], [12], [15]), **(LV3)** or (1.10) arises from investigating problems where one exotic competing species (say, u_3) invades the ecological system of two native species (say, u_1 and u_2) that are competing in the absence of u_3. As indicated in [9, 11], when $u_3(x)$ is absent in **(LV3)** with $\mathbf{e}_- = (\frac{\sigma_1}{c_{11}}, 0)$ and $\mathbf{e}_+ = (0, \frac{\sigma_2}{c_{22}})$, **(LV3)** under the condition of strong competition (i.e. $\frac{\sigma_1}{c_{11}} > \frac{\sigma_2}{c_{21}}$ and $\frac{\sigma_2}{c_{22}} > \frac{\sigma_1}{c_{12}}$) admits solutions $(u_1(x), u_2(x))$ having profiles with $u_1(x)$ being monotonically decreasing and $u_2(x)$ being monotonically increasing. Since $u_1(x)$ and $u_2(x)$ dominate the neighborhoods of $x = -\infty$ and $x = \infty$, respectively, we are led to expect that the profile of $u_3(x)$ must be *pulse-like* (we call $u_3(x)$ a pulse if $u_3(-\infty) = u_3(\infty) = 0$ and $u_3(x) > 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$) if it exists since u_3 will prevail only when u_1 and u_2 are not dominant. It turns out that this conjecture is true under certain assumptions on the parameters. In [4, 5], we established existence

of this type of solution by finding exact traveling wave solutions in addition to numerical experiments.

To the best of our knowledge, however, a priori estimates for the parameter dependence of solutions to **(LV3)** have not yet been found. Corollary 1.2 provides an affirmative answer to the following question:

Q: *Can upper and lower bounds of* $u_1+u_2+u_3$ *can be given in terms of the parameters in* ***(LV3)****?*

The above question arises in attempts to understand the ecological capacity of the inhabitant of the three competing species u_1, u_2, and u_3. Due to limited resources, the investigation of the total density of the three species is of interest. More generally, estimates of $\alpha_1\,u_1+\alpha_2\,u_2+\alpha_3\,u_3$, where $\alpha_i>0$ $(i=1,2,3)$, are given in Corollary 1.2.

Corollary 1.2 (**NBMP for Lotka-Volterra systems of three competing species**). *Assume that* $(u(x),v(x),w(x))$ *is a nonnegative* C^2 *solution to* ***(LV3)****. For any set of* $\alpha_i>0$ $(i=1,2,3)$*, we have*

$$\underline{\lambda}\le\alpha_1\,u_1(x)+\alpha_2\,u_2(x)+\alpha_3\,u_3(x)\le\bar{\lambda},\quad x\in\mathbb{R}, \tag{1.12}$$

where

$$\bar{\lambda} = \max_{i=1,2,3}\Big(\alpha_i\max_{j=1,2,3}\frac{\sigma_j}{c_{ji}}\Big)\Big(\max_{i=1,2,...,n}d_i\Big)\Big(\min_{i=1,2,...,n}d_i\Big)^{-1}, \tag{1.13}$$

$$\underline{\lambda} = \min_{i=1,2,3}\Big(\alpha_i\min_{j=1,2,3}\frac{\sigma_j}{c_{ji}}\Big)\Big(\min_{i=1,2,...,n}d_i\Big)\Big(\max_{i=1,2,...,n}d_i\Big)^{-1}\chi, \tag{1.14}$$

with χ *defined by*

$$\chi=\begin{cases}0, & \text{if}\quad \mathbf{e}_+=(0,0,0)\quad \text{or}\quad \mathbf{e}_-=(0,0,0),\\ 1, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases} \tag{1.15}$$

Proof. We apply Theorem 1.1 to prove Corollary 1.2. Taking

$$\bar{u}_i = \max_{j=1,2,3}\frac{\sigma_j}{c_{ji}}; \tag{1.16}$$

$$\underline{u}_i = \min_{j=1,2,3}\frac{\sigma_j}{c_{ji}}. \tag{1.17}$$

It can be verified that [**H**] is satisfied. Indeed, we have

$$\underline{\mathcal{R}} = \left\{(u_1,u_2,...,u_n)\;\middle|\;\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{u_i}{\min\limits_{j=1,2,3}\frac{\sigma_j}{c_{ji}}}\le 1,\ u_1,u_2,...,u_n\ge 0\right\};$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}} = \left\{(u_1,u_2,...,u_n)\;\middle|\;\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{u_i}{\max\limits_{j=1,2,3}\frac{\sigma_j}{c_{ji}}}\ge 1,\ u_1,u_2,...,u_n\ge 0\right\}.$$

Since $\min\limits_{j=1,2,3}\frac{\sigma_j}{c_{ji}}$ ($\max\limits_{j=1,2,3}\frac{\sigma_j}{c_{ji}}$, respectively) is the smallest (largest, respectively) u_i-intercept of the three hyperplanes $\sigma_i-c_{i1}\,u_1-c_{i2}\,u_2-c_{i3}\,u_3=0$ $(i=1,2,3)$, we see that

$$\sigma_i-c_{i1}\,u_1-c_{i2}\,u_2-c_{i3}\,u_3\ge 0\quad \text{whenever } (u_1,u_2,...,u_n)\in\underline{\mathcal{R}};$$

$$\sigma_i-c_{i1}\,u_1-c_{i2}\,u_2-c_{i3}\,u_3\le 0\quad \text{whenever } (u_1,u_2,...,u_n)\in\bar{\mathcal{R}},$$

for each $i = 1, 2, 3$. The desired result follows from Theorem 1.1.

□

NBMP for the diffusive Lotka-Volterra system of two competing species was established in [3], where it was also shown that under additional restrictions on the parameters, a lower bound stronger than the one given in Proposition 1.3 can be found by employing the tangent line method.

Proposition 1.3 ([3]). *Let $a_1 > 1$ and $a_2 > 1$. Suppose that $(u(x), v(x))$ is C^2, nonnegative, and satisfies the following differential inequalities and asymptotic behavior:*

$$\begin{cases} u_{xx} + \theta\, u_x + u\,(1 - u - a_1\, v) \le 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ d\, v_{xx} + \theta\, v_x + k\, v\,(1 - a_2\, u - v) \le 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ (u, v)(-\infty) = (1, 0), \quad (u, v)(+\infty) = (0, 1), \end{cases} \tag{1.18}$$

where d, k, a_1, a_2 are positive constants. For any $\alpha, \beta > 0$, we have

$$\alpha\, u(x) + \beta\, v(x) \ge \min\left[\frac{\alpha}{a_2\, d}, \frac{\beta}{a_1}\right] \min[1, d^2], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{1.19}$$

We show in Section 3 that the tangent line method can be improved so that the additional parameter restrictions for giving a stronger lower bound than the one given in Proposition 1.3 are no longer needed and, additionally, this lower bound holds for $a_1 > 1$ and $a_2 > 1$.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. NBMP for n species (Theorem 1.1) is proved in Section 2. As an application of Corollary 1.2, we establish in Section 4 a nonexistence result for traveling wave solutions of the Lotka-Volterra system for four competing species

$$\textbf{(LV4)} \begin{cases} d_i (u_i)_{xx} + \theta (u_i)_x + u_i(\sigma_i - c_{i1}\, u_1 - c_{i2}\, u_2 - c_{i3}\, u_3 - c_{i4}\, u_4) = 0,\ x \in \mathbb{R},\ i = 1, ..., 4, \\ (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4)(-\infty) = (\frac{\sigma_1}{c_{11}}, 0, 0, 0), \quad (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4)(\infty) = (0, \frac{\sigma_2}{c_{22}}, 0, 0), \end{cases}$$

where d_i, σ_i, and c_{ij} $(i, j = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ are positive constants; $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ is the propagation speed of the traveling wave.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1. To this end, we first show in Proposition 2.1 that the lower bound given in Theorem 1.1 holds when $(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n)(x)$ is an upper solution of **(BVP)** by constructing an appropriate N-barrier.

Proposition 2.1 (**Lower bound in NBMP**). *Suppose that $u_i(x) \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $u_i(x) \ge 0$ $(i = 1, 2, ..., n)$ and satisfy the following differential inequalities and asymptotic behavior:*

$$\textbf{\textit{(Upper)}} \begin{cases} d_i\,(u_i)_{xx} + \theta\,(u_i)_x + u_i^{m_i}\, f_i(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) \le 0, \quad i = 1, 2, ..., n, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ (u_1, u_2, ..., u_n)(-\infty) = \boldsymbol{e}_-, \quad (u_1, u_2, ..., u_n)(\infty) = \boldsymbol{e}_+, \end{cases}$$

where $\boldsymbol{e}_-$ *and* $\boldsymbol{e}_+$ *are given by* (1.3). *If the hypothesis*

[**H**] *For* $i = 1, 2, ..., n$, *there exist* $\underline{u}_i > 0$ *such that*

$$f_i(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) \geq 0 \quad \textit{whenever } (u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) \in \underline{\mathcal{R}},$$

where $\underline{\mathcal{R}}$ *is as defined in* [**H**]

holds, then we have for any $\alpha_i > 0$ $(i = 1, 2, ..., n)$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \, u_i(x) \geq \min\left(\alpha_1 \, \underline{u}_1, \alpha_2 \, \underline{u}_2, ..., \alpha_n \, \underline{u}_n\right) \frac{\min(d_1, d_2, ..., d_n)}{\max(d_1, d_2, ..., d_n)} \, \chi, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.1}$$

where χ *is defined as in* (1.8).

Proof. For the case where $\mathbf{e}_+ = (0, ..., 0)$ or $\mathbf{e}_- = (0, ..., 0)$, a trivial lower bound 0 of $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \, u_i(x)$ is obvious. It suffices to show (2.1) for the case $\mathbf{e}_+ \neq (0, ..., 0)$ and $\mathbf{e}_- \neq (0, ..., 0)$. To this end, we let

$$p(x) \;=\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \, u_i(x); \tag{2.2}$$

$$q(x) \;=\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \; d_i \, u_i(x). \tag{2.3}$$

Adding the n equations in **(Upper)**, we obtain a single equation involving $p(x)$ and $q(x)$

$$\frac{d^2 q(x)}{dx^2} + \theta \, \frac{dp(x)}{dx} + F(u_1(x), u_2(x), ..., u_n(x)) \leq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $F(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \, u_i^{m_i} \, f_i(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n)$. First of all, we treat the case of $d_i \neq d_j$ at least for some $i, j \in \{1, 2, ..., n\}$.

Determining an appropriate *N-barrier* is crucial in establishing (2.1). The construction of the N-barrier consists of determining λ_2, η, and λ_1 such that the three hyperplanes $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \; d_i \, u_i = \lambda_2$, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \, u_i = \eta$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \; d_i \, u_i = \lambda_1$ satisfy the relationship

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda_1} \subset \mathcal{P}_\eta \subset \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda_2} \subset \underline{\mathcal{R}}, \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}_\eta \;=\; \Big\{(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) \;\Big|\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \, u_i \leq \eta, \; u_1, u_2, ..., u_n \geq 0\Big\}; \tag{2.6}$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_\lambda \;=\; \Big\{(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) \;\Big|\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \; d_i \, u_i \leq \lambda, \; u_1, u_2, ..., u_n \geq 0\Big\}. \tag{2.7}$$

We follow the three steps below to construct the N-barrier:

1. Taking $\lambda_2 = \min\{\alpha_1 \, d_1 \, \underline{u}_1, \alpha_2 \, d_2 \, \underline{u}_2, ...\alpha_n \, d_n \, \underline{u}_n\}$, the hyperplane $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \; d_i \, u_i = \lambda_2$ has the n intercepts $(\frac{\lambda_2}{\alpha_1 \, d_1}, 0, ..., 0)$, $(0, \frac{\lambda_2}{\alpha_2 \, d_2}, 0, ..., 0)$,..., and $(0, 0, ..., 0, \frac{\lambda_2}{\alpha_n \, d_n})$. It is readily seen that $\frac{\lambda_2}{\alpha_i \, d_i} \leq \underline{u}_i$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., n$, which gives $\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda_2} \subset \underline{\mathcal{R}}$;

2. Taking $\eta = \lambda_2 \min\left\{\frac{1}{d_1}, \frac{1}{d_2}, ..., \frac{1}{d_n}\right\}$, the hyperplane $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\, u_i = \eta$ has the n intercepts $(\frac{\eta}{\alpha_1}, 0, ..., 0)$, $(0, \frac{\eta}{\alpha_2}, 0, ..., 0)$,..., and $(0, 0, ..., 0, \frac{\eta}{\alpha_n})$. It is readily seen that $\frac{\eta}{\alpha_i} \le \frac{\lambda_2}{\alpha_i\, d_i}$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., n$, which gives $\mathcal{P}_\eta \subset \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda_2}$;

3. Taking $\lambda_1 = \eta \min\{d_1, d_2, ..., d_n\}$, the hyperplane $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\, d_i\, u_i = \lambda_1$ has the n intercepts $(\frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_1\, d_1}, 0, ..., 0)$, $(0, \frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_2\, d_2}, 0, ..., 0)$,..., and $(0, 0, ..., 0, \frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_n\, d_n})$. It is readily seen that $\frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_i\, d_i} \le \frac{\eta}{\alpha_i}$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., n$, which gives $\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda_1} \subset \mathcal{P}_\eta$.

The three hyperplanes $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\, d_i\, u_i = \lambda_2$, $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\, u_i = \eta$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\, d_i\, u_i = \lambda_1$ constructed above form the N-barrier. From the above three steps, it follows immediately that λ_1 is given by

$$\lambda_1 = \min\left(\alpha_1\, d_1\, \underline{u}_1, \alpha_2\, d_2\, \underline{u}_2, ..., \alpha_n\, d_n\, \underline{u}_n\right) \frac{\min(d_1, d_2, ..., d_n)}{\max(d_1, d_2, ..., d_n)}. \tag{2.8}$$

We claim that $q(x) \ge \lambda_1$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$. This proves (2.1) since the $\alpha_i > 0$ $(i = 1, 2, ..., n)$ are arbitrary. Suppose that, contrary to our claim, there exists $z \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $q(z) < \lambda_1$. Since $u, v \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n)(\pm\infty) = \mathbf{e}_\pm$, we may assume $\min_{x\in\mathbb{R}} q(x) = q(z)$. We denote respectively by z_2 and z_1 the first points at which the solution $(u_1(x), u_2(x), ..., u_n(x))$ intersects the hyperplane $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\, d_i\, u_i = \lambda_2$ when x moves from z towards ∞ and $-\infty$. For the case where $\theta \le 0$, we integrate (2.4) with respect to x from z_1 to z and obtain

$$q'(z) - q'(z_1) + \theta\,(p(z) - p(z_1)) + \int_{z_1}^z F(u_1(x), u_2(x), ..., u_n(x))\, dx \le 0. \tag{2.9}$$

On the other hand we have:

- due to $\min_{x\in\mathbb{R}} q(x) = q(z)$, $q'(z) = 0$;

- $q(z_1) = \lambda_2$ follows from the fact that z_1 is on the hyperplane $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\, d_i\, u_i = \lambda_2$. Since z_1 is the first point for $q(x)$ taking the value λ_2 when x moves from z to $-\infty$, we conclude that $q(z_1 + \delta) \le \lambda_2$ for $z - z_1 > \delta > 0$ and $q'(z_1) \le 0$;

- $p(z) < \eta$ since z is below the hyperplane $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\, u_i = \eta$; $p(z_1) > \eta$ since z_1 is above the hyperplane $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\, u_i = \eta$;

- let $\mathcal{F}_+ = \{(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n)\,|\,F(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) > 0, u_1, u_2, ..., u_n \ge 0\}$. Due to the fact that $(u_1(z_1), u_2(z_1), ..., u_n(z_1))$ is on the hyperplane $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\, d_i\, u_i = \lambda_2$ and $(u_1(z), u_2(z), ..., u_n(z)) \in \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda_1}$, $(u_1(z_1), u_2(z_1), ..., u_n(z_1))$, $(u_1(z), u_2(z), ..., u_n(z)) \in \mathcal{R}$ by (2.5). Because of [**H**] and $F(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\, u_i^{m_i}\, f_i(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n)$, it is easy to see that $\{(u_1(x), u_2(x), ..., u_n(x))\,|\,z_1 \le x \le z\} \subset \mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{F}_+$. Therefore we have $\int_{z_1}^z F(u_1(x), u_2(x), ..., u_n(x))\, dx > 0$.

Combining the above arguments, we obtain

$$q'(z) - q'(z_1) + \theta\,(p(z) - p(z_1)) + \int_{z_1}^z F(u_1(x), u_2(x), ..., u_n(x))\, dx > 0, \tag{2.10}$$

which contradicts (2.9). Therefore when $\theta \le 0$, $q(x) \ge \lambda_1$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. For the case where $\theta \ge 0$, integrating (2.4) with respect to x from z to z_2 yields

$$q'(z_2) - q'(z) + \theta\,(p(z_2) - p(z)) + \int_z^{z_2} F(u_1(x), u_2(x), ..., u_n(x))\,dx \le 0. \tag{2.11}$$

In a similar manner, it can be shown that $q'(z_2) \ge 0$, $q'(z) = 0$, $p(z_2) > \eta$, $p(z) < \eta$, and $\int_z^{z_2} F(u_1(x), u_2(x), ..., u_n(x))\,dx > 0$. These together contradict (2.11). Consequently, (2.1) is proved for the case of $d_i \ne d_j$ at least for some $i, j \in \{1, 2, ..., n\}$. Now we turn to the case of $d_i = d$ for all $i = 1, 2, ..., n$. In this case, $q(x) = d\,p(x)$ and (2.4) becomes

$$d\,\frac{d^2p(x)}{dx^2} + \theta\,\frac{dp(x)}{dx} + F(u_1(x), u_2(x), ..., u_n(x)) \le 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.12}$$

We take $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = d\,\min\{\alpha_1\,\underline{u}_1, \alpha_2\,\underline{u}_2, ..., \alpha_n\,\underline{u}_n\}$ and $\eta = \min\{\alpha_1\,\underline{u}_1, \alpha_2\,\underline{u}_2, ..., \alpha_n\,\underline{u}_n\}$. It follows that the three hyperplanes $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\,d_i\,u_i = \lambda_2$, $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\,u_i = \eta$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\,d_i\,u_i = \lambda_1$ coincide. Analogously to the previous case, we assume that there exists $\hat{z} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $p(\hat{z}) < \lambda_1$ and $\min_{x\in\mathbb{R}} p(x) = p(\hat{z})$. Due to $\min_{x\in\mathbb{R}} p(x) = p(\hat{z})$, we have $p'(\hat{z}) = 0$ and $p''(\hat{z}) \ge 0$. Since $(u_1(\hat{z}), u_2(\hat{z}), ..., u_n(\hat{z}))$ is in the interior of $\mathcal{R}$, which is contained in the interior of $\mathcal{F}_+$, we have $F(u_1(\hat{z}), u_2(\hat{z}), ..., u_n(\hat{z})) > 0$. These together give $d\,p''(\hat{z}) + \theta\,p'(\hat{z}) + F(u_1(\hat{z}), u_2(\hat{z}), ..., u_n(\hat{z})) > 0$, which contradicts (2.12). As a result, $p(x) \ge \lambda_1$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ when $d_i = d$ for all $i = 1, 2, ..., n$. The proof is completed. □

When $(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n)(x)$ is a lower solution of **(BVP)**, the upper bound in Theorem 1.1 can be proved in a similar manner.

Proposition 2.2 (**Upper bound in NBMP**). *Suppose that $u_i(x) \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $u_i(x) \ge 0$ $(i = 1, 2, ..., n)$ and satisfy the following differential inequalities and asymptotic behavior:*

$$\textbf{\textit{(Lower)}}\begin{cases} d_i\,(u_i)_{xx} + \theta\,(u_i)_x + u_i^{m_i}\,f_i(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) \ge 0, \quad i = 1, 2, ..., n, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ (u_1, u_2, ..., u_n)(-\infty) = \boldsymbol{e}_-, \quad (u_1, u_2, ..., u_n)(\infty) = \boldsymbol{e}_+, \end{cases}$$

where $\boldsymbol{e}_-$ and $\boldsymbol{e}_+$ are given by (1.3). *If the hypothesis*

[$\bar{\mathbf{H}}$] *For $i = 1, 2, ..., n$, there exist $\bar{u}_i > 0$ such that*

$$f_i(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) < 0 \quad \textit{whenever } (u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) \in \bar{\mathcal{R}},$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ is as defined in [$\mathbf{H}$]

holds, then we have for any $\alpha_i > 0$ $(i = 1, 2, ..., n)$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\,u_i(x) \le \max\left(\alpha_1\,\bar{u}_1, \alpha_2\,\bar{u}_2, ..., \alpha_n\,\bar{u}_n\right) \frac{\max(d_1, d_2, ..., d_n)}{\min(d_1, d_2, ..., d_n)}. \tag{2.13}$$

Proof. The proof lies in the fact that an appropriate N-barrier for the upper bound (2.13) can be constructed. Let

$$\mathcal{P}_\eta = \left\{(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) \;\middle|\; \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\,u_i \ge \eta,\ u_1, u_2, ..., u_n \ge 0\right\}; \tag{2.14}$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_\lambda = \left\{(u_1, u_2, ..., u_n) \;\middle|\; \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\,d_i\,u_i \ge \lambda,\ u_1, u_2, ..., u_n \ge 0\right\}. \tag{2.15}$$

We determine λ_2, η, and λ_1 in the following steps:

1. Taking $\lambda_2 = \max\{\alpha_1\, d_1\, \bar{u}_1, \alpha_2\, d_2\, \bar{u}_2, ...\alpha_n\, d_n\, \bar{u}_n\}$, the hyperplane $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\ d_i\, u_i = \lambda_2$ has the n intercepts $(\frac{\lambda_2}{\alpha_1\, d_1}, 0, ..., 0)$, $(0, \frac{\lambda_2}{\alpha_2\, d_2}, 0, ..., 0)$,..., and $(0, 0, ..., 0, \frac{\lambda_2}{\alpha_n\, d_n})$. It follows that $\frac{\lambda_2}{\alpha_i\, d_i} \geq \bar{u}_i$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., n$, which gives $\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda_2} \supset \bar{\mathcal{R}}$;

2. Taking $\eta = \lambda_2 \max\Big\{\frac{1}{d_1}, \frac{1}{d_2}, ..., \frac{1}{d_n}\Big\}$, the hyperplane $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\, u_i = \eta$ has the n intercepts $(\frac{\eta}{\alpha_1}, 0, ..., 0)$, $(0, \frac{\eta}{\alpha_2}, 0, ..., 0)$,..., and $(0, 0, ..., 0, \frac{\eta}{\alpha_n})$. It follows that $\frac{\eta}{\alpha_i} \geq \frac{\lambda_2}{\alpha_i\, d_i}$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., n$, which gives $\mathcal{P}_\eta \supset \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda_2}$;

3. Taking $\lambda_1 = \eta\, \max\{d_1, d_2, ..., d_n\}$, the hyperplane $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\ d_i\, u_i = \lambda_1$ has the n intercepts $(\frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_1\, d_1}, 0, ..., 0)$, $(0, \frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_2\, d_2}, 0, ..., 0)$,..., and $(0, 0, ..., 0, \frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_n\, d_n})$. It follows that $\frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha_i\, d_i} \geq \frac{\eta}{\alpha_i}$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., n$, which gives $\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda_1} \supset \mathcal{P}_\eta$.

The three hyperplanes $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\ d_i\, u_i = \lambda_2$, $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\, u_i = \eta$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\ d_i\, u_i = \lambda_1$ constructed above form the N-barrier which satisfies the property

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda_1} \supset \mathcal{P}_\eta \supset \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda_2} \supset \bar{\mathcal{R}}. \tag{2.16}$$

It follows immediately that λ_1 is given by

$$\lambda_1 = \max\left(\alpha_1\, \bar{u}_1, \alpha_2\, \bar{u}_2, ..., \alpha_n\, \bar{u}_n\right) \frac{\max(d_1, d_2, ..., d_n)}{\min(d_1, d_2, ..., d_n)}. \tag{2.17}$$

We claim that $q(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\ d_i\, u_i(x) \leq \lambda_1$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ by contradiction as we have done in Propositions 2.1. The detailed proof of the claim is omitted here for brevity. This completes the proof. □

We are now in the position to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. In Propositions 2.1 and 2.2, we obtain a lower and upper bound for $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i\, u_i(x)$, respectively. Combining the results in Propositions 2.1 and 2.2, we immediately establish Theorem 1.1. □

3 Improved tangent line method

In [3], it is shown that under certain restrictions on the parameters, the lower bound in Proposition 1.3 can be improved by means of the tangent line method. In this section, we show that an improved lower bound can be given without additional conditions on the parameters. To achieve this, let us denote by $\mathcal{L}$ the quadratic curve $\alpha\, u\, (1 - u - a_1\, v) + \beta\, k\, v\, (1 - a_2\, u - v) = 0$ in the first quadrant of the uv-plane, i.e.

$$\mathcal{L} = \Big\{(u, v)\ \Big|\ H(u, v) = 0, u \geq 0, v \geq 0\Big\}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $H(u,v) := \alpha\, u\,(1-u-a_1\, v) + \beta\, k\, v\,(1-a_2\, u - v)$. Under the bistable condition $a_1 > 1$ and $a_2 > 1$, we observe that $H(u,v) = 0$ is a hyperbola with one branch through $(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$ and the other branch through $(0,0)$. Let

$$\mathbf{Q}_\lambda = \Big\{(u,v) \;\Big|\; \alpha\, u + d\,\beta\, v \le \lambda,\ u,v \ge 0\Big\}; \tag{3.2}$$

$$\mathbf{R} = \Big\{(u,v) \;\Big|\; H(u,v) \ge 0,\ u,v \ge 0\Big\}. \tag{3.3}$$

It is readily seen from the proof of Proposition 2.1 that a stronger lower bound can be found if we determine λ_2 in the first step for the construction of the N-barrier by

$$\lambda_2 = \sup_{\mathbf{Q}_\lambda \subset \mathbf{R}} \lambda. \tag{3.4}$$

To determine λ_2 given by (3.4), we find the tangent line with the slope $-\frac{\alpha}{d\,\beta}$ to $\mathcal{L}$ at a given point on $\mathcal{L}$. To this end, we first solve $v = v(u)$ from $H(u,v) = 0$ to get

$$v(u) = \frac{-(\alpha a_1 u + \beta k(a_2 u - 1)) + \sqrt{(\alpha a_1 u + \beta k(a_2 u - 1))^2 - 4\alpha\beta k u(u-1)}}{2\beta k}. \tag{3.5}$$

A straightforward calculation yields

$$\frac{dv(u)}{du} = \frac{-(\alpha a_1 + \beta k a_2) + \frac{(\alpha a_1 u + \beta k(a_2 u - 1))(\alpha a_1 + \beta k a_2) - 2\alpha\beta k(2u-1)}{\sqrt{(\alpha a_1 u + \beta k(a_2 u-1))^2 - 4\alpha\beta k u(u-1)}}}{2\beta k}. \tag{3.6}$$

It immediately follows that the slope of the tangent line to $H(u,v) = 0$ at the point $(0,1)$ (respectively, $(1,0)$) is $\frac{dv(0)}{du} = \frac{-\alpha(a_1-1)-\beta k a_2}{\beta k}$ (respectively, $\frac{dv(1)}{du} = \frac{-\alpha}{\alpha a_1 + \beta k(a_2-1)}$). Under the bistable condition $a_1 > 1$ and $a_2 > 1$, we easily verify $\frac{-\alpha(a_1-1)-\beta k a_2}{\beta k} < \frac{-\alpha}{\alpha a_1 + \beta k(a_2-1)}$. Noting that the slope of the line $\alpha\, u + d\,\beta\, v = \lambda_2$ is $-\frac{\alpha}{d\,\beta}$, we are led to the following three cases:

(i) When $\frac{-\alpha}{d\beta} \le \frac{-\alpha(a_1-1)-\beta k a_2}{\beta k}$, we determine the line $\alpha\, u + d\,\beta\, v = \lambda_2$ so that it passes through $(0,1)$ and hence $\lambda_2 = d\,\beta$. Note that in this case z_2 may be $+\infty$ in the proof of Proposition 1.3 (Figure 3.1 (i)).

(ii) When $\frac{-\alpha}{d\beta} \ge \frac{-\alpha}{\alpha a_1 + \beta k(a_2-1)}$, we determine the line $\alpha\, u + d\,\beta\, v = \lambda_2$ so that it passes through $(1,0)$ and hence $\lambda_2 = \alpha$. Note that in this case z_1 may be $-\infty$ in the proof of Proposition 1.3 (Figure 3.1 (ii)).

(iii) When $\frac{-\alpha(a_1-1)-\beta k a_2}{\beta k} < \frac{-\alpha}{d\beta} < \frac{-\alpha}{\alpha a_1 + \beta k(a_2-1)}$, we determine the line $\alpha\, u + d\,\beta\, v = \lambda_2$ so that it is tangent to the curve $v = v(u)$ at some point in the first quadrant of the uv-plane. By (3.6), we have

$$\frac{-(\alpha a_1 + \beta k a_2) + \frac{(\alpha a_1 u + \beta k(a_2 u-1))(\alpha a_1 + \beta k a_2) - 2\alpha\beta k(2u-1)}{\sqrt{(\alpha a_1 u + \beta k(a_2 u-1))^2 - 4\alpha\beta k u(u-1)}}}{2\beta k} = \frac{-\alpha}{d\beta} \tag{3.7}$$

or

$$\frac{Au^2 + Bu + C}{Du^2 + Eu + J} = G, \tag{3.8}$$



Figure 3.1: N-barrier for cases (i), (ii) and (iii) (from the left to the right)

where

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \left(X^2 - 4\alpha\beta k\right)^2, & B &= (X^2 - 4\alpha\beta k)(-\beta k X + 2\alpha\beta k), \\ C &= (-\beta k X + 2\alpha\beta k)^2, & D &= X^2 - 4\alpha\beta k, \\ E &= -2\beta k X + 4\alpha\beta k, & J &= \beta^2 k^2, \\ G &= \left(X - 2\alpha k\, d^{-1}\right)^2, & X &= \alpha a_1 + \beta k a_2. \end{aligned}$$

Then u is solved from (3.8) by

$$u = \frac{-(B - EG) \pm \sqrt{(B - EG)^2 - 4(A - DG)(C - JG)}}{2(A - DG)}. \tag{3.9}$$

Consequently, $\lambda_2 = \alpha\, u + d\, \beta\, v(u)$ is determined by (3.5) and (3.9), where u is given by (3.9) with u satisfying $0 < u < 1$ and (3.7) (Figure 3.1 (iii)).

4 Nonexistence of four species waves

With the aid of Corollary 1.2, we establish a nonexistence result for **(LV4)** in this section. Recall **(LV4)** is as follows:

$$\textbf{(LV4)} \begin{cases} d_i(u_i)_{xx} + \theta(u_i)_x + u_i(\sigma_i - c_{i1}\, u_1 - c_{i2}\, u_2 - c_{i3}\, u_3 - c_{i4}\, u_4) = 0,\ x \in \mathbb{R},\ i = 1, ..., 4, \\ (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4)(-\infty) = (\frac{\sigma_1}{c_{11}}, 0, 0, 0), \quad (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4)(\infty) = (0, \frac{\sigma_2}{c_{22}}, 0, 0). \end{cases}$$

Theorem 4.1 (**Nonexistence of four species waves**). *Assume that the following hypotheses hold:*

[**H1**] $\tilde{\sigma}_i := \sigma_i - c_{i4}\, \sigma_4\, c_{44}^{-1} > 0$ *for* $i = 1, 2, 3$*;*

[**H2**] $\min\limits_{i=1,2,3} \left(\alpha_i^* \min\limits_{j=1,2,3} \dfrac{\tilde{\sigma}_j}{c_{ji}}\right) \left(\min\limits_{i=1,2,...,n} d_i\right) \left(\max\limits_{i=1,2,...,n} d_i\right)^{-1} \geq \sigma_4$, *where* $\alpha_i^* = c_{4i}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$.

Then ***(LV4)*** *has no positive solution* $(u_1(x), u_2(x), u_3(x), u_4(x))$.

Proof. We prove by contradiction. Suppose to the contrary that there exists a solution $(u_1(x), u_2(x), u_3(x), u_4(x))$ to **(LV4)**. It follows from the fact $u_4(x) > 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u_4(\pm\infty) = 0$, that there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max_{x\in\mathbb{R}} u_4(x) = u_4(x_0) > 0$, $u_4''(x_0) \le 0$, and $u_4'(x_0) = 0$. Due to $d_4\,(u_4)_{xx} + \theta\,(u_4)_x + u_4\,(\sigma_4 - c_{41}\,u_1 - c_{42}\,u_2 - c_{43}\,u_3 - c_{44}\,u_4) = 0$, we obtain

$$\sigma_4 - c_{41}\,u_1(x_0) - c_{42}\,u_2(x_0) - c_{43}\,u_3(x_0) - c_{44}\,u_4(x_0) \ge 0, \tag{4.1}$$

which gives

$$u_4(x) \le u_4(x_0) \le \frac{1}{c_{44}}\big(\sigma_4 - c_{41}\,u_1(x_0) - c_{42}\,u_2(x_0) - c_{43}\,u_3(x_0)\big) < \frac{\sigma_4}{c_{44}},\ x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.2}$$

As a result, we have

$$\begin{cases} d_1\,(u_1)_{xx} + \theta\,(u_1)_x + u_1\,(\sigma_1 - c_{14}\,\sigma_4\,c_{44}^{-1} - c_{11}\,u_1 - c_{12}\,u_2 - c_{13}\,u_3) \le 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ d_2\,(u_2)_{xx} + \theta\,(u_2)_x + u_2\,(\sigma_2 - c_{24}\,\sigma_4\,c_{44}^{-1} - c_{21}\,u_1 - c_{22}\,u_2 - c_{23}\,u_3) \le 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ d_3\,(u_3)_{xx} + \theta\,(u_3)_x + u_3\,(\sigma_3 - c_{34}\,\sigma_4\,c_{44}^{-1} - c_{31}\,u_1 - c_{32}\,u_2 - c_{33}\,u_3) \le 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

Because of [**H1**], we apply Corollary 1.2 to the last three inequalities, and obtain a lower bound of $c_{41}\,u_1(x) + c_{42}\,u_2(x) + c_{43}\,u_3(x)$:

$$c_{41}\,u_1(x)+c_{42}\,u_2(x)+c_{43}\,u_3(x) \ge \min_{i=1,2,3}\Big(\alpha_i^* \min_{j=1,2,3}\frac{\tilde{\sigma}_j}{c_{ji}}\Big)\Big(\min_{i=1,2,\ldots,n} d_i\Big)\Big(\max_{i=1,2,\ldots,n} d_i\Big)^{-1},\ x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.4}$$

The hypothesis [**H2**] then yields

$$c_{41}\,u_1(x) + c_{42}\,u_2(x) + c_{43}\,u_3(x) \ge \sigma_4,\ x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.5}$$

which contradicts (4.1). This completes the proof.

□

Biological interpretation of Theorem 4.1: When other parameters are fixed, it is easy for [**H1**] and [**H2**] to hold true as long as σ_4 is sufficiently small. Biologically, this means that when the intrinsic growth rate σ_4 of u_4 is sufficiently small, the four species u_1, u_2, u_3 and u_4 cannot coexist in the ecological system **(LV4)** under certain parameter regimes.

Acknowledgments. The authors wish to express sincere gratitude to Dr. Tom Mollee for his careful reading of the manuscript and valuable suggestions and comments to improve the readability and accuracy of the paper. The research of L.-C. Hung is partly supported by the grant 104EFA0101550 of Ministry of Science and Technology, Taiwan.

References

[1] R. A. Armstrong and R. McGehee, *Competitive exclusion*, Amer. Natur., 115 (1980), pp. 151–170.

[2] R. S. Cantrell and J. R. Ward, Jr., *On competition-mediated coexistence*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 57 (1997), pp. 1311–1327.

[3] C.-C. Chen and L.-C. Hung, *A maximum principle for diffusive lotka-volterra systems of two competing species*, J. Differ. Equ., To appear. https://arxiv.org/abs/1509.00071

[4] C.-C. Chen, L.-C. Hung, M. Mimura, M. Tohma, and D. Ueyama, *Semi-exact equilibrium solutions for three-species competition-diffusion systems*, Hiroshima Math J., 43 (2013), pp. 176–206.

[5] C.-C. Chen, L.-C. Hung, M. Mimura, and D. Ueyama, *Exact travelling wave solutions of three-species competition-diffusion systems*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B, 17 (2012), pp. 2653–2669.

[6] S.-B. Hsu and T.-H. Hsu, *Competitive exclusion of microbial species for a single nutrient with internal storage*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 68 (2008), pp. 1600–1617.

[7] S. B. Hsu, H. L. Smith, and P. Waltman, *Competitive exclusion and coexistence for competitive systems on ordered Banach spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 348 (1996), pp. 4083–4094.

[8] L.-C. Hung, *An n-barrier maximum principle for elliptic systems arising from the study of traveling waves in reaction-diffusion systems*, submitted. https://arxiv.org/abs/1509.00278

[9] ——, *Exact traveling wave solutions for diffusive Lotka-Volterra systems of two competing species*, Jpn. J. Ind. Appl. Math., 29 (2012), pp. 237–251.

[10] S. R.-J. Jang, *Competitive exclusion and coexistence in a Leslie-Gower competition model with Allee effects*, Appl. Anal., 92 (2013), pp. 1527–1540.

[11] Y. Kan-on, *Parameter dependence of propagation speed of travelling waves for competition-diffusion equations*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 26 (1995), pp. 340–363.

[12] J. Kastendiek, *Competitor-mediated coexistence: interactions among three species of benthic macroalgae*, Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 62 (1982), pp. 201–210.

[13] R. M. May and W. J. Leonard, *Nonlinear aspects of competition between three species*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 29 (1975), pp. 243–253. Special issue on mathematics and the social and biological sciences.

[14] R. McGehee and R. A. Armstrong, *Some mathematical problems concerning the ecological principle of competitive exclusion*, J. Differential Equations, 23 (1977), pp. 30–52.

[15] M. Mimura and M. Tohma, *Dynamic coexistence in a three-species competition–diffusion system*, Ecological Complexity, 21 (2015), pp. 215–232.

[16] J. D. Murray, *Mathematical biology*, vol. 19 of Biomathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second ed., 1993.

[17] H. L. Smith and P. Waltman, *Competition for a single limiting resource in continuous culture: the variable-yield model*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 54 (1994), pp. 1113–1131.

[18] A. I. Volpert, V. A. Volpert, and V. A. Volpert, *Traveling wave solutions of parabolic systems*, vol. 140 of Translations of Mathematical Monographs, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1994. Translated from the Russian manuscript by James F. Heyda.